

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

The Examiner indicates that claims 5-7 and 14 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten into independent form including the limitations of the claims from which they depend. With this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 5-7 and 14 into independent form, each including the limitations of claim 1 from which they previously depended. Applicants therefore request allowance of claims 5-7 and 14.

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Zigmond (U.S. Patent 6,698,020) in view of Alexander (U.S. Patent 6,177,931). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Zigmond, in view of Alexander and Hendricks (U.S. Patent 6,408,437). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Zigmond, in view of Alexander and Rakavy (U.S. Patent 6,317,789). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Zigmond, in view of Alexander and Seth-Smith (U.S. Patent 4,866,770).

With this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, and 12, as previously suggested by the Examiner during the telephone interview of December 15, 2004 (the Interview Summary for this Interview is in the record). This amendment clarifies the mobile nature of the reception/user site. Applicants submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the currently –claimed method for presenting advertisement data, transmitted by using broadcasting, to *mobile* users, as recited in claim 1 or the currently-claimed advertisement apparatus, comprising *inter alia* “a *mobile* advertisement receiver which receives said

advertisement data and presents it to users,” as recited in claim 9. Further, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the currently –claimed *mobile* advertisement receiver of claim 11 or the “Recording medium which ... stores programs allowing a *mobile* reception computer to exercise the processes of ...,” as recited in claim 12.

Therefore, Applicants submits that independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 12 are patentable over any reasonable combination of the cited references and that claims 1-4, 8, 10, and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1 or claim 9.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-4, and 8-13 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 09/699,554

**Q61559**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 19, 2007